

AU/ACSC/207/1999-04

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

THE MILITARY AIRPORT PROGRAM:
AIR POWER FOR CIVIL AVIATION

by

Robert F. Surgeoner, LCDR, USN

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: CDR Albert L. St. Clair

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1999

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-04-1999		2. REPORT TYPE Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-1999 to xx-xx-1999	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Military Airport Program: Air Power for Civil Aviation Unclassified				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Surgeoner, Robert F. ;				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Air Command and Staff College Maxwell AFB, AL36112				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE ,					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Throughout U.S. aviation history, military aviation has shared numerous links to civil aviation. This report summarizes some of that shared history, and briefly describes significant legislation from the early 1900's through modern day issues. Furthermore, it specifically addresses the origin and development of the Military Airport Program, one of five designated set-aside funds under the Airport Improvement Program. Legislatively established in fiscal year 1991, the intent of the program was to take advantage of the numerous existing facilities at military bases identified for realignment or closure under Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), and to convert them to civil or joint-use fields for minimal cost. As such, these airfields could then relieve more congested metropolitan airfields nearby, reduce projected departure and arrival delays, and significantly contribute to the overall capacity of the United States' air transportation system. Administered by the Federal Aviation Administration, the program was harshly criticized in a General Accounting Office report in 1994. Since then, the FAA has taken numerous steps, acting upon the GAO's recommendations, to clarify and further define eligibility criteria for candidate airfields. This report will detail the GAO's investigation, conclusions, and recommendations, and compare them to the current state of the program. The author will also provide the reader with examples of the conversion process at work by briefly looking at each of the airports currently in the Military Airport Program.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Public Release	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 44	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Fenster, Lynn lfenster@dtic.mil
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007		
					Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
FUNDAMENTALS OF THE MILITARY AIRPORT PROGRAM.....	5
INTENTIONS AND RESULTS	8
Selection Criteria	8
Program Goals	9
Congestion Relief.....	11
Civilian and Joint Use.....	12
Selection Confusion.....	12
Poor Funding Allocation.....	13
Conclusions and Recommendations	16
ENACTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19
CONCLUSIONS.....	21
Course Correction	21
Snapshots	22
Williams Gateway.....	23
Myrtle Beach International	23
San Bernardino International	23
Rickenbacker International	24
Alexandria International	24
Austin-Bergstrom International	25
Millington Municipal.....	25
Sawyer Airport.....	26
Homestead Regional	27
APPLICATION PROCEDURES.....	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	37

Tables

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1. MAP Airports FY 1991-1993	11
Table 2. MAP Airports in Fiscal Year 1998	22

Abstract

Throughout U.S. aviation history, military aviation has shared numerous links to civil aviation. This report summarizes some of that shared history, and briefly describes significant legislation from the early 1900's through modern day issues. Furthermore, it specifically addresses the origin and development of the Military Airport Program, one of five designated set-aside funds under the Airport Improvement Program. Legislatively established in fiscal year 1991, the intent of the program was to take advantage of the numerous existing facilities at military bases identified for realignment or closure under Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), and to convert them to civil or joint-use fields for minimal cost. As such, these airfields could then relieve more congested metropolitan airfields nearby, reduce projected departure and arrival delays, and significantly contribute to the overall capacity of the United States' air transportation system.

Administered by the Federal Aviation Administration, the program was harshly criticized in a General Accounting Office report in 1994. Since then, the FAA has taken numerous steps, acting upon the GAO's recommendations, to clarify and further define eligibility criteria for candidate airfields. This report will detail the GAO's investigation, conclusions, and recommendations, and compare them to the current state of the program. The author will also provide the reader with examples of the conversion process at work by briefly looking at each of the airports currently in the Military Airport Program.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Though many people may think of military and civil aviation as separate entities, air power in its most general sense combines all elements of both. The United States government considers airlines to be much like public utilities, offering services that are said to be in the public interest for the need of the United States citizen.¹ The public interest in civil aviation spans across three main areas. The first, commerce, is the everyday business of the country, and includes both passenger transportation and air cargo transportation. Postal service, the second public interest, provided much of the rich history of the development of civil aviation, and is still instrumental in it today. In fact, 90% of all intercity first-class letters are carried by the airlines.² The third aspect of public interest served by the civil air industry is national defense, which also encompasses international affairs.³

It is the aspect of national defense that binds military and civilian air power. United States' history is full of examples where the two have come together as one, serving both the purposes of the military and civilian communities. Military pilots were once used to deliver mail for the United States Postal Service. Many joint-use airports are in operation throughout the country today. Aircraft manufacturers design products for civilian and military applications, and technologies developed in both the civilian and military sectors

are exchanged between the two to benefit both. As such, it should come as no surprise then that there have also been many legislative acts throughout the United States' history that have affected both military and civilian air power.

In 1940, the Development of Landing Areas for National Defense (DLAND) Act was the legal impetus for construction of small airports around the country. Many of these are still in operation today, mostly in the general aviation community, and are easily recognizable by their triangular shapes consisting of three 5,000-foot long runways.⁴ A major piece of air power legislation was passed in 1958. Entitled the Federal Aviation Act, it made the Secretary of Transportation responsible for developing and operating an air traffic control system for both civil and military aircraft, and further stated that he/she must consider the needs of national defense in exercising his/her authority over U. S. navigable airspace.⁵

Two organizations were affected as a result of Executive Order No. 11090 signed by President John F. Kennedy on February 26, 1963. The order redefined emergency preparedness functions and created the War Air Service Program (WASP). In turn, the WASP directly affected the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). The War Air Service Program was "designed to provide for the maintenance of essential civil air routes and services, and to provide for the distribution and redistribution of aircraft among civil air transport carriers after the withdrawal of aircraft allocated to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet."⁶ In conjunction with the War Air Service Program, the Civil Reserve Air Fleet identified "air carrier aircraft allocated by the Secretary of Transportation to the Department of Defense to meet essential military needs in the event of an emergency."⁷ Much has been written, discussed and debated about the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. In

short, Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers get preferential treatment when applying for non-defense government business, and peacetime contracts for carrying cargo and passengers. The amount of business they receive is directly proportional to the number of aircraft they make available to the CRAF. Currently, there are over 500 such aircraft in the program. Though initially established by President Harry S. Truman in 1951 in response to the Korean War, it was never actually activated until August 1990 after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.⁸

The Department of Transportation Act of 1966 further solidified the ties that bind U.S. military and civilian air power. It directed the United States Coast Guard to maintain interoperability with the Department of Defense to include military activities that support national security, and further defined the mission of the Federal Aviation Administration to support the Department of Defense in wartime. Executive Order 11161 further stated that the Federal Aviation Administration will be transferred to the Department of Defense in the event of war, and will function as an adjunct of it.⁹ Lastly, the Airport Improvement Program was developed to provide federal capital assistance to ensure airport capacity meets military, commercial, and safety needs. It is the nation's major program for planning and improving its airport infrastructure. A multi-billion dollar program administered by the Federal Aviation Administration, it includes legislatively established funding categories, called set-asides, for specific uses.¹⁰ The author will examine one such set-aside, the Military Airport Program.

Notes

¹ Robert M. Kane, *Air Transportation*, 12th ed. (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1993), 1-6.

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

Notes

⁴ Dr. Hank Lehrer, *MAS 602, The Air Transportation System, Session 2*, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 180 min., 1996, videocassette.

⁵ Kane, 5-26.

⁶ Kane, 1-16.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ Kane, 1-18 – 1-19.

⁹ Kane, 6-27.

¹⁰ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, *Airport Improvement Program: The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact*, June 1994, 1.

Chapter 2

Fundamentals of the Military Airport Program

The Airport and Airways Improvement Act of 1982 established the Airport Improvement Program grant. Under it, the Federal Aviation Administration provides funding for airport planning and development projects that enhance capacity, safety, security, and noise mitigation. The FAA has designated about 3,300 airports as critical to the national airport system and thus eligible for Airport Improvement Program funds. The funds are distributed on the basis of a legislated entitlement formula through one of five set-aside categories earmarked for specific types of airports or projects. The five set-asides are Military Airports, Planning, Small Commercial Airports, Relievers, and Noise.¹ The Military Airport Program set-aside of the Airport Improvement Program grant was established in Fiscal Year 1991. The original legislation required the Secretary of Transportation to select up to eight current or former military airports to receive not less than 1.5 percent of the total Airport Improvement Program funding from the set-aside in fiscal years 1991 and 1992, a total of \$29.3 million and \$29.5 million, respectively.² The criteria for receiving such grants include the stipulations that the airport must meet to be eligible for the program. Specifically, it must be a former or current military airport, it must have the potential for conversion to either a public-use commercial service or reliever airport, and its conversion must enhance airport and air

traffic control system capacity in major metropolitan areas and reduce current and projected flight delays. The Secretary of Transportation delegated the identification and recommendation of qualified airports to the Federal Aviation Administration.³ The FAA eventually published criteria to clarify eligibility for the Military Airport Program. It said selected airports must be located in or near a major metropolitan area presently experiencing or projected to experience high levels of annual air carrier delay (exceeding 20,000 annual hours) at the existing air carrier airport. Airports could also be eligible if, in the opinion of the Secretary, they were in or near a location where its development would result in an increase in overall airport system capacity.⁴ The designated airports are then eligible to participate in the program for five fiscal years following their designation.⁵ As of the end of FY 1995, 17 major military airfields had been converted to civil use. All were airfields identified in the 1988, 1991, and 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission reports.⁶

By granting funds for the conversion of such airports, the former bases can contribute significantly to the national air transportation system. They enhance airport and air traffic control system capacity in their respective metropolitan areas, as well as reduce current and projected flight delays. The alternative course of action, building new airports and their associated facilities, would quickly deplete all the funds in the Airport Improvement Program. The Military Airport Program costs only a fraction of the amount, yet provides the increased infrastructure upon which to build. The costs then, are mainly to convert the military airfield for civilian use. These primarily include the construction of terminal buildings that are not normally a part of military airfields, but may also include land acquisition; security improvements; runway, apron, and taxiway

construction and improvements; and lighting improvements. When combined, these costs to the local communities acquiring the excess facilities can quickly become a financial burden.⁷ Federal aid, in the former of Military Airport Program grants, is the apparatus designed to shoulder that burden.

Notes

¹ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, *Airport Improvement Program: The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact*, June 1994, 21.

² General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 2.

³ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 3.

⁴ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 6.

⁵ Federal Aviation Administration, *13th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 1994, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/app500/annrep94/aip.htm>.

⁶ Federal Aviation Administration, *14th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 1995, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.Airportnet.org/depts/federal/faa/aip14th.htm>.

⁷ *ibid.*

Chapter 3

Intentions and Results

Selection Criteria

The actual percentages of Airport Improvement Program funds and dollar amounts designated for the Military Airport Program have been adjusted throughout the years of its existence. The selection criteria have also been refined. Fiscal Year 1998 criteria allowed the Secretary of Transportation to designate, redesignate, and fund capital development for up to 12 airports. At least 4 percent of Airport Improvement Program funds would be available to the Military Airport Program, but no more than \$26 million.¹ The Secretary could consider current or former military airports that were realigned or closed under Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) procedures, if the airport is classified as a commercial service or reliever airport in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). A commercial service airport is a publicly owned airport that has at least 2,500 passenger boardings each year and receives scheduled passenger service. A reliever airport is an airport designated by the FAA to relieve congestion at a commercial service airport and to provide more general aviation access to the overall community.² The Secretary could also consider current or former military airports at which grants would result in reduced delays at airports having more than 20,000 hours of annual delay in passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings. Such airports and their

associated metropolitan areas are identified in the FAA's Aviation Capacity Enhancement Plan. Lastly, the Secretary could consider current or former military airfields at which grants would enhance airport and air traffic control system capacity in a metropolitan area, or reduce current or projected flight delays.³

In designating an airport for Military Airport Program funds, the Federal Aviation Administration evaluates the need for the proposed projects, and whether the projects are related to conversion or capacity of that airport or the air traffic system. The Secretary of Transportation intends to provide funds to those airports that have the greatest conversion needs, where the benefits to the capacity of the air traffic control or airport system can be maximized, or the contribution to reducing congestion can be maximized. In most cases, approved BRAC closing or realigned bases or active bases with new joint use agreements will be the locations with the greatest conversion needs.⁴

Program Goals

While the criteria for selection appear to be fairly clear, this was not always the case. In a scathing report to Senator Frank R. Lautenberg, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies, Senate Appropriations Committee, the United States General Accounting Office reviewed the Military Airport Program. Their findings were summed up in the report's subtitle: "The Military Airport Program has not Achieved Intended Impact."⁵

The June 1994 report focused on two broad issues. The first was to determine whether Military Airport Program airports were selected in accordance with the program's goals of enhancing capacity systemwide and providing conversion-related assistance. The second was to determine whether the FAA had effectively allocated

Military Airport Program funds to ensure that they were having their intended impact.⁶ As the subtitle suggests, the GAO's findings were not favorable in either case.

The GAO found that nine of the 12 airports in the Military Airport Program at the time did not meet key legislatively established program goals. Five were not located in congested traffic areas and were unlikely to increase capacity, either in major metropolitan areas or systemwide. Nine of the selected airports had already been operating as joint or civilian airports for 10 or more years, and many of them already had the kinds of facilities in place that the program was designed to develop. The report also said FAA officials were unclear about the types of airports the program was intended to assist, and that they felt pressured to nominate the maximum number of candidates within the legislated time frames. However, the GAO pointed out that the program's legislation specifically allowed the FAA to nominate fewer than the maximum number of airports if there were not enough qualified candidates available.⁷

The GAO also found that the FAA granted funding to only 23 percent of the types of conversion-related projects identified in the program's legislation. Additionally, they concluded the FAA funded relatively low-priority projects for such things as snow removal equipment and service roads and continued to fund airports that no longer had conversion-related needs. FAA officials countered that the program's legislation did not clearly define projects that are related to conversion. The GAO in turn, found no effort on the FAA's part to better define such needs or to develop an effective mechanism for allocating the funds. Lastly, the GAO reported that the FAA had not analyzed the impact of the program on enhancing capacity in major metropolitan areas or systemwide. This, they concluded, was a critical factor in demonstrating the viability of the program as a

special set-aside. The GAO determined that “until corrective actions are taken, the appropriateness of the current level of set-aside funding and the continued need for the program remain in question.”⁸

The 12 airports that were in the Military Airport Program at the time of the GAO’s report are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. MAP Airports FY 1991-1993

Airport	State
Stewart International Airport	New York
Lincoln Municipal Airport	Nebraska
Manchester Municipal Airport	New Hampshire
Mid-America Airport	Illinois
Pease International Tradeport	New Hampshire
Myrtle Beach Airport	South Carolina
Smyrna Airport	Tennessee
Albuquerque International Airport	New Mexico
Ellington Field	Texas
Laredo International Airport	Texas
Agana International Air Terminal	Guam
San Bernardino International Airport	California

Source: FAA, 13th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program, 1994.

Congestion Relief

As previously discussed, one criterion for airport eligibility in the Military Airport Program was that the selected airport be located in or near a major metropolitan area presently experiencing or projected to experience high levels of annual air carrier delay at the existing airport. The only exception to this criterion was for airports in or near a location where, in the opinion of the Secretary, the development of the airport would result in an increase in overall airport system capacity. However, five of the selected airports—Albuquerque International, Guam International, Laredo International, Lincoln Municipal, and Myrtle Beach Jetport—did not meet the criterion.⁹ The GAO said the

FAA did not adequately justify to the Secretary of Transportation how these locations would increase overall system capacity. In fact, the FAA even noted that three of the airports—Laredo International, Myrtle Beach Jetport, and Smyrna Airport—would not significantly contribute to enhancing systemwide capacity.¹⁰

Civilian and Joint Use

Military Airport Program legislation emphasized the conversion of appropriate former military air bases to civil use, and identifying and improving additional joint use facilities. Nine of the twelve selected airports had already been converted to successful civilian or joint-use facilities. However, they had all been converted over 10 years prior to their selection, six of them had been converted over 20 years prior, and one had been providing civilian service for 42 years.¹¹ The GAO determined that because they had been converted for such relatively long periods of time, many of those nine airports already had the terminals, fuel farms, utilities, and parking lots for which the program provided funding.¹²

Selection Confusion

Legislation authorizing the Military Airport Program provided the FAA with flexibility in the number of airports nominated, said the GAO. However, the FAA recommended that the Secretary of Transportation designate the maximum number of airports as soon as possible. FAA officials told the GAO they were unsure about which former military airports to choose because legislation did not clearly define the types of airports the program was intended to assist, or specifically require them to include recently closed bases.¹³ The officials said it was for those reasons that they did not feel compelled to delay their decisions until such candidates became eligible, or to seek

congressional clarification on selection criteria. They instead believed that Congress wanted the maximum number designated within the legislated time frames.¹⁴

FAA officials also told the GAO that they did not have a comprehensive listing of potential program airports from which to choose. The authorizing legislation required a survey to identify current and former military airports with the greatest potential to improve systemwide capacity to be completed by September 30, 1991. However, as of May 1994, the FAA still had not completed it.¹⁵ Thus, the FAA chose its nominees only from airports that had specifically applied for Military Airport Program funding. Of those 36 applicants, over one-half were already operating as effective commercial service airports.¹⁶

Poor Funding Allocation

The General Accounting Office also criticized the FAA's ability to properly allocate Military Airport Program funds. They determined the FAA lacked an effective allocation process, and that they had not ensured that the investments were having their intended impact of assisting in the conversion of selected airports that are likely to enhance systemwide capacity. The GAO further reported that the FAA directed only a fraction of Military Airport Program funds to conversion-related projects specifically identified in the program's legislation, and continued to provide funding to some airports with questionable conversion-related needs. Thus, the GAO said, the FAA had little basis for assessing the impact of the investments or identifying which airports should be "graduated" from the program.¹⁷

The GAO's findings centered on legislation in the Military Airport Program that allowed participating airports to use part of their funds for certain designated projects.

Examples included up to \$5 million for revenue-generating terminal areas, and up to \$4 million for parking lots, fuel farms, and utilities.¹⁸ However, they found that the FAA had allocated only 23 percent of all Military Airport Program funds to such conversion-related projects at the selected airports.¹⁹ Furthermore, only six of the airports had actually used the funds for projects such as terminals, fuel farms, utilities, or parking lots. Additionally, three of those had only used less than 12 percent of their total funds on those types of projects.²⁰ Two other airports had only used their funds to expand and upgrade existing terminal facilities, not for projects that the funds were intended. The FAA admitted that they had not emphasized conversion-related projects to airports whom they granted funds. As a result, the majority of the funding was spent for runways, taxiways, land, and aprons, the same types of projects that are funded through other set-asides in the Airport Improvement Program.²¹

In a number of instances, the GAO was particularly critical of the FAA's lack of understanding with regards to the funding process. Two airports had received between \$2.5 million and \$5.0 million each year. Yet the airports continued to spend the funds on low-priority projects such as snow removal equipment, access roads, and service roads.²² Additionally, one of those airports had been effectively converted to civilian use for over 40 years, and was not located near a congested metropolitan area, and generated about \$5 million per year for its own use from an associated industrial park.²³ As if that weren't enough, the GAO found at least three other airports that had spent program funds for similar projects. The FAA simply responded that three of the airports had special program-related needs that could not have been met through other funding sources.²⁴

Again the GAO asserted its contention that the FAA lacked an effective funding process for the program. It pointed out specific program-related projects identified in the Military Airport Program legislation, yet said FAA officials believed program-related projects were not clearly identified, nor did they make any effort to obtain clarification. In the eyes of the FAA, the Military Airport Program was just another source of funds for them to distribute as they would any other Airport Improvement Program set-aside.²⁵

The GAO found the FAA to be lacking a plan for each program airport to identify conversion-related needs, decide which of those needs will receive program funding and in what order, and evaluate progress in meeting those needs. As a result, the FAA had no criteria to determine when an airport was officially converted and no longer needed funding. Thus there were no conditions for ending an airport's participation in the program, discouraging the use of funds for low-priority projects, or making room for more needy airports as they became eligible.²⁶ In fact, the FAA had not determined a "graduation date" for any of the program's airports, nor did they have any plan to do so. They merely assumed that selected airports had at least five years' worth of development needs that could be funded. There was no ongoing assessment to see if the needs had been met before the five-year eligibility period. Thus, once selected, an airport was all but guaranteed to remain funded without question for at least the next five years. Not surprisingly, officials from 11 of the funded airports told GAO officials that they planned to remain in the program beyond the five year eligibility period if allowed to do so.²⁷ The GAO specifically mentioned Scott Air Force Base, one such participant, who had a 10-year letter of intent for \$14 million per year in Airport Improvement Program funds, \$5 million of which would come annually from the Military Airport Program.²⁸

Conclusions and Recommendations

Predictably, the General Accounting Office's conclusions were harsh. It said the Military Airport Program was not having its intended impact, and that the FAA had not established clear criteria to define program-related needs.²⁹ Additionally, it stated the FAA failed to identify airports with needs located near congested metropolitan areas, nor had it developed an effective strategy for allocating program funds among selected airports, or assessing the overall impact of funds and the continued eligibility of participating airports. As a result, the GAO determined there was no assurance that the program could significantly impact capacity in major metropolitan areas or systemwide, and that the FAA could not determine which airports were best qualified to meet the goals of the program. Thus the GAO called for major changes in the program, emphasizing a more proactive FAA role at a minimum.³⁰

The GAO recommended a number of items for the Secretary of Transportation to direct the FAA to accomplish. The first was to define what constitutes a congestion-reducing or conversion-related need and base future Military Airport Program participation and funding decisions on these criteria. Secondly, it recommended completion of the legislatively required survey to identify a comprehensive list of current and former military airports with the greatest potential to improve systemwide capacity. Thirdly, it recommended development of an implementation plan for each program airport that includes cataloging conversion-related needs, deciding which of those needs will receive program funding and in what order, and establishing graduation dates linked to a level of civilian service achieved. Lastly, the recommendations included determining the impact of the program in reducing congestion and enhancing capacity in major

metropolitan areas, and providing the results and recommendations to the Congress as a basis for possible changes to the program.³¹

It also provided a number of matters for the Congress to consider to improve the proper distribution of funds within the national airport system. A first option was for Congress to consider limiting participation in the program to airports located in FAA-defined congested areas, and whose first civilian use occurred after the 1988 and later BRAC processes. A second option involved establishing a financial cap on the program while still allowing FAA discretion to lower, but not increase, the number of participating airports or the overall Military Airport Program funding level, on the basis of ongoing needs assessments at each airport.³²

Notes

¹ Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration [4910-13], *Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements, and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program*, May 20, 1998, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/announ.doc>.

² Federal Aviation Administration, *14th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 1995, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.airportnet.org/depts/federal/faa/aip14th.htm>.

³ Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration [4910-13], *Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements, and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program*, May 20, 1998, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/announ.doc>.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, *Airport Improvement Program: The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact*, June 1994.

⁶ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 1.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 2.

⁹ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 6.

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 8.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 9.

Notes

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 10.

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ *ibid.*

²² General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 12.

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*

²⁵ *ibid.*

²⁶ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 13.

²⁷ *ibid.*

²⁸ *ibid.*

²⁹ *ibid.*

³⁰ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, 14.

³¹ *ibid.*

³² *ibid.*

Chapter 4

Enacting the Recommendations

Though the 1994 General Accounting Office's report to the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies was very critical of the Federal Aviation Administration's handling of the Military Airport Program, the FAA did not seem to take exception to it. To its credit, the Administration's officials generally agreed with the GAO's recommendations. They believed that they were meeting the legislative selection criteria, and requested only that the GAO recommendations address the need to clarify the intent of the Military Airport Program legislation.¹

The FAA enacted several of the recommendations in the GAO's June 1994 report immediately.² In its *13th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, the FAA reported on activities for fiscal year 1994, which ended on September 30, 1994, only three months after the GAO's report. It specifically mentioned the establishment of new criteria for airport grants, including the requirement that grants under the Military Airport Program must "reduce delays at an airport with more than 20,000 hours of annual delays in commercial passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings."³ Additionally, it specified that airports would have to demonstrate in their applications how those projects would reduce delays, and that eligible airports would be allowed to participate in the program for five fiscal years following their designation. At

least 2.5% of Airport Improvement Program funds were to have been set aside for the Military Airport Program in each of the three fiscal years from 1994 through 1996. Though temporarily reduced to 1.8% in fiscal year 1996, the percentages translated to \$39.6 million at 12 airfields in 1994,⁴ \$31.3 million at 12 airfields in 1995,⁵ and \$26 million in 1996.⁶ Seven airports had graduated from the program after fiscal year 1995. The FAA had planned to graduate one more after fiscal year 1996, and four more after fiscal year 1997, so that by the end of that fiscal year, all 12 Military Airport Program airports would have graduated.⁷ In 1995, the FAA also completed its survey to identify potential candidates for the program. It found four airports that had the potential to reduce delays at commercial airports exceeding 20,000 hours of annual delays. Two of those, Norton AFB in California, and Pease AFB in New Hampshire, had already participated in the program. The remaining two, Williams AFB in Arizona and George AFB in California, met eligibility criteria, were interested in the program, and had not previously participated.⁸

Notes

¹ General Accounting Office/RCED-94-209, *Airport Improvement Program: The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact*, June 1994, 15.

² Federal Aviation Administration, *13th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 1994, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/app500/annrep94/aip.htm>.

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Federal Aviation Administration, *14th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 1995, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.Airportnet.org/depts/federal/faa/aip14th.htm>.

⁶ General Accounting Office/T-RCED-96-94, *Airport Improvement Program: Military Airport Program and Reliever Set-Aside Update*, March 13, 1996, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.gao.gov/AindexFY96/abstracts/rc96094t.htm>.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

Chapter 5

Conclusions

Course Correction

It appears that refinements to the Military Airport Program resulting from the General Accounting Office's 1994 report have put the program back on course to achieve its intended impact. As of August 1997, the GAO only addressed one recommendation that hadn't been completed. That recommendation was for the Secretary of Transportation to direct the Federal Aviation Administration to "complete, before additional program selections are made, the legislatively required survey to identify a comprehensive list of current and former military airports with the greatest potential to improve systemwide capacity."¹ The survey had been completed, included both current and former military airfields, and analyzed congested metropolitan areas and the status of military airfields approved for closure with respect to their conversion to civil airports, but was still under final FAA review. As such, it had not yet been submitted to Congress.²

Additionally, the FAA now specifically outlines factors it will consider when evaluating candidate airports and the airports that would be relieved by program participants. It also requires precise documentation from applicant airports to ensure their qualifications in the program. Lastly, it provides an extensive list of projects that

could be eligible under the Military Airport Program if needed for conversion-related or capacity-related purposes, and distinguishes those between “airside” and “landside” projects.³ The complete “Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program (MAP)” is included in Appendix A.

Snapshots

By fiscal year 1998, the former Williams AFB in Phoenix, Arizona, had become a participant in the Military Airport Program for its conversion to Williams Gateway Airport.⁴ The former George AFB in Victorville, California, was converted to Southern California International Airport,⁵ but had not enrolled in the Military Airport Program. Table 2 identifies the fiscal year 1998 Military Airport Program participants. The concluding section will briefly describe how the civil airports are using their converted military airfields.

Table 2. MAP Airports in Fiscal Year 1998

Military Airfield	Civil Airport	Location
Williams AFB	Williams Gateway	Phoenix, AZ
Myrtle Beach AFB	Myrtle Beach International	Myrtle Beach, SC
Norton AFB	San Bernardino International	San Bernardino, CA
Rickenbacker AFB	Rickenbacker International	Columbus, OH
England AFB	Alexandria International	Alexandria, LA
Bergstrom AFB	Austin-Bergstrom International	Austin, TX
Memphis NAS	Millington Municipal	Millington, TN
K.I. Sawyer AFB	Sawyer Airport	Gwinn, MI
Homestead ARB	Homestead Regional	Homestead, FL

Source: Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration [4910-13], *Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements, and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program*, May 20, 1998.

Williams Gateway

Williams Air Force Base was closed in 1993 and created a loss of more than 3,800 jobs and \$300 million in annual economic activity.⁶ The state and communities began work immediately to redevelop the base after the announcement of closure in 1991. The plan determined the base be developed as an aerospace center and an educational, research and training facility with the airport serving as a reliever to Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. Aviation uses identified included commercial passenger service, aircraft manufacturing, maintenance, modification, air cargo operations and flight training.⁷

Myrtle Beach International

The Myrtle Beach Air Force Base closed its gates for good in 1993.⁸ Several air carriers and rental car agencies now call Myrtle Beach International home. The airport advertises a full line of aircraft services for the general aviation public, but makes little or no mention of its Air Force Base history.⁹

San Bernardino International

The former Norton Air Force Base property, now referred to as the San Bernardino International Airport and Trade Center is distributed into two segments, a non-aviation and an aviation portion. The San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) is administering the redevelopment of the 1,300 acres of aviation-related property and facilities. The San Bernardino International Airport is a full-service aviation facility and one of the main features of the San Bernardino International Airport and Trade Center. Its 10,000-foot concrete runway is stressed to accommodate any 747 sized military and civilian aircraft. Located 60 miles east of Los Angeles at the intersection of Interstate

freeways, and the Santa Fe, Southern Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads, San Bernardino International Airport is perfectly situated to funnel freight and passengers in and out of Southern California.¹⁰

Rickenbacker International

Rickenbacker International Airport (LCK) is a joint-use reliever airport specializing in air cargo. The airport is regularly served by six airlines conducting scheduled and charter operations to and from domestic and international locations. FedEx operates one of its six U.S. cargo hubs from a 274,000 square foot (25,500 square meter) sortation center. Other important cargo users of Rickenbacker include UPS, Evergreen Airlines, Polar Air Cargo and Geologistics (formerly LEP Profit).¹¹

Rickenbacker International Airport handles approximately 666,000 pounds (302 metric tons) of freight per day. In 1997, the airport enplaned and deplaned a total of 243.1 million pounds (110,247 metric tons) of freight. This was an increase of 45 percent over 1996 and nearly 6 times the amount handled in 1991. Air cargo carriers performed 6,820 aircraft operations in 1997.¹²

Alexandria International

Located at England Airpark is Alexandria International Airport. Ideally located in the central part of Louisiana, AEX offers service and convenient transportation for businesses and individuals within a 200-mile radius. With two on-site runways, Alexandria International Airport presently serves commercial, general aviation, and military customers. Commercial air service began on August 18, 1996. This major air facility includes one of only three twenty-four hour air traffic control towers within the

state, no noise restrictions, Index D Airport rescue and Fire Fighting, 24 hour security and Part 139 Certified.¹³

England's air organization also provides numerous services and facility for aviation related interests. In addition to commercial passenger service, air traffic operations, air traffic control, and a weather center, England Airpark offers facilities for aircraft operations and maintenance as well as hangars with a maximum size of 79,500 square feet of space for aircraft and supplies.¹⁴

Austin-Bergstrom International

Austin-Bergstrom International Airport is carefully planned to meet the needs of Central Texans well into the 21st century. A multi-use facility, the airport will host general aviation, commercial aviation, the State Aircraft Pooling Board, and the Texas Army National Guard. A central courtyard area, the Market Place, in the Barbara Jordan Passenger Terminal, will showcase Texas-flavored shops and restaurants. At the Cybersmith Café travelers can check e-mail, surf the web and otherwise stay connected. A stage area will routinely play host to Austin musicians and book signings.¹⁵

Millington Municipal

The Base Reuse Committee was formed to facilitate the conversion of land declared excess by the U.S. Navy during the 1993 cycle of the Base Realignment and Closure process for military installations.

There are two major areas of the excess property:

An airport with an 8,000 foot runway. The City of Millington established an "Airport Authority" to deal with the various problems of establishing a civilian airport and also determining and funding its operating level. The Airport Authority is in the process of

installing an Instrument Landing System. Installation should be complete within the next three to four months.¹⁶

Over a period of time, the remainder of the land will be available for economic development. While there are many problems to deal with, the economic potential for Millington is tremendous. During this process, Millington will have to utilize the services of various professional organizations to complete the conversion.¹⁷

Sawyer Airport

Situated on over 5,200 acres of land in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, the "Sawyer Air & Industrial Facility" is one of the newest major U.S. bases built by the Air Force and is extremely well suited in its new civilian role. It offers world class industrial, high-tech, and aviation businesses excellent development opportunities.¹⁸

Touting state of the art air facilities, an excellent highway system, and access to nearby rail and water ports, Sawyer is readily accessible via multiple transportation modes providing the capacity to meet the demands of all business needs. Sawyer comprises an outstanding mixture of commercial and industrial facilities that encompass well over one million square feet of floor space. Additionally, Sawyer's unique location can provide companies with opportunities for business growth on a regional, national, or global scale. The area work force is among the most productive and loyal in the United States, and the region consistently has a cost of living index that averages 10 to 30 percent lower than many other national locations with similar facilities. All of these facts add up to a competitive edge in today's challenging business environment.¹⁹

Utilizing the world-class air facilities located at Sawyer, aircraft operators have access to an all weather runway 12,300 feet long and 300 feet wide. Additionally, the

region's wide-open airspace offers ease of operations for an extremely safe and delay free air traffic setting.²⁰

The aircraft maintenance facilities on Sawyer include hangers capable of enclosing everything up to a B-757, allowing for year round operations on a large scale. Air operations at Sawyer provide the air side users with the capability to handle everything from the smallest to the largest aircraft currently operation in the world today.²¹

Homestead Regional

Metro Dade County currently provides limited facilities as well as aircraft and passenger services. Days and hours for civil use are currently restricted.²²

The National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) has appealed a Dade County, Fla., permit that authorizes construction of an airport large enough to rival Miami International. Issued by the South Florida Water Management District, the permit would allow the redevelopment of Homestead Air Reserve Base (ARB) into an international airport ten times the size of the former base. Analysts are predicting the proposed airport will serve more than 230,000 flights per year. It would accept cargo and passenger planes and would be similar in size and capacity to JFK International Airport in New York City.²³ However, The NPCA contends the eventual outcome will be 25 jets an hour flying directly over Biscayne National Park, causing a severe disruption to the park's natural habitat, and contributing to numerous other environmentally-damaging factors such as urban sprawl, and water pollution. Proponents of the airport redevelopment claim it would boost Homestead's economy, damaged by Hurricane Andrew in 1992, and relieve air traffic pressure at Miami International.²⁴

Notes

¹ General Accounting Office, *Status of Open Recommendations FY97, Airport Improvement Program – The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact. RCED-94-209. 06/30/94 (Letter Report)*, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.gao.gov/openrecs97/abstracts/rc94209.htm>.

² *ibid.*

³ Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration [4910-13], *Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements, and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program*, May 20, 1998, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/announ.doc>.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Federal Aviation Administration, *Military Base Conversion*, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 8 December 1998, available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/closlist.html>.

⁶ “Williams Gateway,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.flywga.org/history.htm>.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ “Myrtle Beach International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February, 1999, available from <http://www.southparkvillage.com>.

⁹ “Myrtle Beach International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.state.sc.us/commerce/airport/myr.htm#passenger>.

¹⁰ “San Bernardino International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.eee.org/gov/ivda/sbiaa.htm>.

¹¹ “Rickenbacker International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.rickenbacker.org/airport.html>.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ “Alexandria International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.englandairpark.org/air.htm>.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ “Austin-Bergstrom International,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/newairport/projsum.htm>.

¹⁶ “Millington Municipal,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from http://www.zaptek.com/millington/base_reuse.html.

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ “Sawyer Airport,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://www.up.bresnan.net/mqtedc/SAWYER.HTM>.

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ *ibid.*

²² “Homestead Regional,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from http://www.miami-airport.com/index_text_only.html.

²³ Katurah Mackay, “Airport Imperils Florida Parks,” *NPCA Park News*, n.p.; on-line, Internet, 6 February 1999, available from <http://npca.org/home/npca/np/98-01/jf98ne02.html>.

²⁴ *ibid.*

Appendix A

Application Procedures

[4910-13]

**Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration**

Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program (MAP).

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of criteria for application and designation, redesignation, or continued participation, in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program (MAP).

SUMMARY: This notice announces the criteria, application procedures and schedule to be applied by the Secretary of Transportation in designating, redesignating, and funding capital development for up to 12 airports in the 1998 MAP.

The 1998 MAP allows the Secretary to consider current or former military airports: (1) that were realigned or closed under Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) procedures or

10 USC 2687 (property normally reported to the General Services Administration for disposal); or (2) current or former military airports at which grants would reduce delays at airports that have 20,000 hours of annual delay in passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings; or (3) at current or former military airports which grants would enhance airport and air traffic control system capacity in a metropolitan area.

DATES: Airport sponsors should address written applications for designation, redesignation, or continued participation, in the fiscal year 1998 Military Airport Program to the Federal Aviation Administration Regional Airports Division or Airports District Office that serves the airport. Applications must be received by that office of the FAA by June 26.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and two copies of Standard Form 424, "Application for Federal Assistance," and supporting and justifying documentation, specifically requesting to be considered for designation, redesignation to participate, or continue, in the fiscal year 1998 Military Airport Program, to the Regional FAA Airports Division or Airports District Office that serves the airport.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. James V. Mottley or Leonard C. Sandelli, Military Airport Program Branch (APP-420), Office of Airport Planning and Programming, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591, (202) 267-8780, or (202) 267-8785, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

General Description of the Program: The Military Airport Program provides assistance to current or former military airports in converting them to civil use, thereby contributing to the capacity of the national air transportation system and/or reducing congestion. Airports designated under the program may obtain funds from a set-aside of four percent of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) discretionary funds to undertake eligible airport development, including certain types of projects not otherwise eligible for AIP assistance.

Number of Airports: A maximum of 12 airports can participate in the 1998 MAP. There are eight airports currently designated and the Secretary can designate up to four more. The current participating airports are: Millington Municipal Airport, Millington, Tennessee; Myrtle Beach International Airport, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina; Williams Gateway Airport, Chandler, Arizona; Austin Bergstrom International Airport, Austin, Texas; Homestead Regional Airport, Homestead, Florida; Rickenbacker Airport, Columbus, Ohio; San Bernardino International Airport, San Bernardino, California; Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Michigan; and Alexandria International Airport, Alexandria, Louisiana.

Amount of MAP funds: The Secretary of Transportation shall allocate at least 4.0 percent of the Discretionary Airport Improvement Program grant funds available to airports designated under the 1998 MAP. However, for FY 1998 the amount is limited to \$26,000,000.

Term of designation: Five years is the maximum period of eligibility for any airport to participate in the MAP unless an airport sponsor reapplies and is redesignated for another five year period.

Reapplication: Section 124 of the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 permits previously designated airports to apply for an additional five-year period. The airport must have satisfactory MAP eligible projects and must continue to satisfy the designation criteria for the MAP.

Eligible Projects: In addition to other eligible AIP projects, terminals, fuel farms and utility systems and surface parking lots and hangars are eligible to be funded from the MAP.

New Designation and Redesignation Considerations: In making designations of new candidate airports, the Secretary of Transportation will consider the following general requirements:

1. The airport is a Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) or 10 USC 2687 closure or realignment, classified as a commercial service or reliever airport in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS); or
2. The airport and grants issued for projects at the airport would reduce delays at an airport with more than 20,000 hours of annual delays in commercial passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings. Airports with 20,000 or more hours of delay and their associated metropolitan areas are identified in the FAA's Aviation Capacity Enhancement Plan DOT/FAA, Office of System Capacity, 1997 Aviation Capacity Enhancement Plan; or
3. The airport would enhance airport and air traffic control system capacity in a metropolitan area or reduce current or projected flight delays.

The application will be evaluated on how the proposed airport and associated projects would make these contributions to conversion and congestion relief and/or how the airport would enhance air traffic or airport system capacity.

Project Evaluation: The FAA will evaluate the need for the projects in the candidate airport's five year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and whether these projects are related to conversion or capacity of that airport or the airport and/or air traffic system. It is the intent of the Secretary of Transportation to fund those airports that have the greatest conversion needs and/or where the benefits to the capacity of the air traffic control or airport system can be maximized, and/or the contribution to reducing congestion can be maximized. Generally, the recently approved BRAC or Title 10 Section 2678 closing or realigned bases or active bases with new joint use agreements will be the locations with the greatest conversion needs.

1. The FAA will evaluate the candidate airports and/or the airports such candidates would relieve based on the following factors:
 - compatibility of airport roles;
 - the capability of the candidate airport and its airside and landside complex to serve aircraft that otherwise must use the relieved airport;
 - landside surface access;
 - airport operational capability, including peak hour and annual throughput capacities of the candidate airport;
 - potential of other metropolitan area airports to relieve the congested airport;
 - ability to satisfy or meet air cargo demand within the metropolitan area;
 - forecasted aircraft and passenger levels, type of air carrier service anticipated, i.e., scheduled and/or charter air carrier service;

- type of aircraft projected to serve the airport and level of operation at the relieved airport and the candidate airport;
- the potential for the candidate airport to be served by aircraft or users, including the airlines, serving the congested airport;
- ability to replace an existing commercial service or reliever airport serving the area; and
- any other documentation to support the FAA designation of the candidate airport.

2. The FAA will evaluate the conversion and capacity related needs which, if funded would make the airport a more viable civil airport.

This procedure conforms with FAA procedures for administering the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 47118, as amended by Section 116 of Public Law 103-305 (August 23, 1994), and the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES:

Airport sponsors applying for consideration for inclusion (“candidate airports” or “Redesignation”) or continuation in the MAP (“current airports applying for continuation”) must complete a Standard Form 424, “Application for Federal Assistance,” and submit documentation to the appropriate FAA office as outlined below. Each sponsor must specifically state in the Standard Form 424, or in its transmittal, that the airport is: (1) applying in response to this notice for consideration as a new candidate for the MAP; (2) if designated in 1994 or thereafter, that the airport is applying as a continuing participant in the MAP; or (3) applying for redesignation. The additional information and data required to support the MAP criteria must be attached to the Application.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES AND REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION New Candidate Airports and Airports Applying for Redesignation for Another Five-Year Term.

Submit an Application for Federal Assistance, Standard Form 424, along with the documentation and justification indicated below to request designation by the Secretary of Transportation to participate in the Military Airport Program. This should identify the airport as either a current or former military airport and identify whether it was closed or realigned under Public Law 100-526, Public Law 101-510 (Installations Approved for Closure by the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commissions), 10 USC 2687 (bases closed by DOD and reported to the General Services Administration) or a joint use of an active military airfield.

A. Qualifications for additional candidates:

For (1) through (6) below the applicant does not need to resubmit any documentation that has been previously submitted to the regional Airports division or Airports district office. There is no need to submit duplicate information in response to this notice.

(1) Documentation that the airport meets the definition of a “public airport” as defined in 49 U.S.C. Section 47102(16).

(2) Documentation that the required environmental review process for civil reuse or joint-use of the military airfield has been completed. (This is not the environmental review for the projects under this program, but the environmental review necessary for title transfer, a long-term lease, or a joint use agreement). The environmental reviews and approvals must indicate that the airport would be able to receive grants during the five years in the program.

(3) In the case of a former military airport, documentation that the local or State airport sponsor holds or will hold satisfactory title, a long term lease in furtherance of conveyance of property for airport purposes, or a long term interim lease for 22 years or more, to the property on which the civil airport is being located. The capital development project needs to be in place for 20 years. In the case of a current military airport, documentation that the airport sponsor has an existing joint-use agreement with the military department having jurisdiction over the airport. This is necessary so the FAA can legally issue grants to the sponsor.

(4) Documentation that the service level the airport is expected to provide is a “commercial service airport” or a “reliever airport” as defined in 49 U.S.C. 47102(7) and 47102(18), respectively, and is included in the current National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems.

(5) Documentation that the airport has an eligible airport “sponsor” as defined in 49 U.S.C. 47102(19).

(6) Documentation that the airport has an approved airport layout plan (ALP) and a five year capital improvement plan indicating all eligible grant projects either seeking to be funded from the MAP or other portions of the Airport Improvement Program. The five year plan must also specifically identify the capacity and conversion related projects, associated costs and projected five year schedule of project construction, including those requested for consideration for 1998 MAP funding.

(7) Information identifying the existing and potential levels of visual or instrument operations and aeronautical activity at the current or former military airport and, if applicable, the relieved airport. Also, if applicable, information on how the airport

contributes to air traffic system or airport system capacity. If served by commercial air carriers, the revenue passenger and cargo levels should be provided.

(8) A description of the projected civil role and development needs for transitioning from use as a military airfield to a civil airport, as appropriate, and how development projects would serve to convert the airport to civil use and/or reduce delays at an airport with more than 20,000 hours of annual delay in commercial passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings and/or how the projects would contribute to the airport and air traffic control system capacity in a metropolitan area or reduce current or projected flight delays.

(9) A description of the existing airspace capacity. Describe how anticipated new operations would affect the surrounding airspace and air traffic flow patterns in the metropolitan area in or near which a current or former military airport is located. Include a discussion of the level to which operations at this airport create airspace conflicts that may cause congestion or whether air traffic works into the flow of other air traffic in the area.

(10) A description of the five-year capital improvement plan (CIP), including a discussion of major projects, their priorities, projected schedule for project accomplishment, and estimated costs. Capacity related and/or conversion related projects should be specifically identified, especially those that the airport sponsor proposes to fund under the MAP. A copy of the CIP should also be submitted.

(11) A description of projects that are consistent with the role of the airport and effectively contribute to converting the airfield to a civil airport. Projects can be related to various improvement categories depending on the need to convert from military to civil airport use, to meet required civil airport standards, and/or required to provide capacity to the airport and/or airport system. The projects selected, i.e., safety related, conversion-related, and capacity-related, must be identified and fully explained based on the airport's planned use. The sponsor needs to submit the airport layout plan (ALP) and other maps or charts that clearly identify and help clarify the eligible projects and designate them as conversion-related, or capacity-related. It should be cross-referenced with the project costs and project descriptions. Projects that could be eligible under MAP if needed for conversion-related or capacity-related purposes include:

Airside:

- Modification of airport or military airfield for safety purposes or airport pavements (including widths), marking, lighting or strengthening, and of structures or other features in the airport environs to meet civil standards for airport imaginary surfaces.

- Facilities or support facilities such as passenger terminal gates, aprons for passenger terminals, taxiways to new terminal facilities, aircraft parking, and cargo facilities to accommodate civil use.

- Modification of airport or military utilities (electrical distribution systems, communications lines, water, sewer, drainage) to meet civil standards. Also, modifications that allow civil airport utilities to operate independently if other portions of the base are to parties other than the airport. (This is important where portions of the base are being transferred to an entity different from the airport sponsor.)

- Purchase, rehabilitation, or modification of airport and support facilities, including aircraft rescue and fire fighting buildings and equipment, airport security requirements, lighting vaults, and reconfiguration or relocation of buildings for more efficient civil airport operations, and snow removal equipment.

- Modification of airport or military airfield fuel systems and fuel farms to accommodate civil aviation activities.

- Acquisition of additional land for runway protection zones, other approach protection, or airport development.

Landside:

- Construction of surface parking areas and access roads to accommodate automobiles in the airport terminal area and provide an adequate level of access to the airport.

- Construction or relocation of access roads to provide efficient and convenient movement of vehicular traffic to, on and from the airport, including access to passenger, air cargo, fixed base operations, and aircraft maintenance areas.

- Modification or construction of facilities such as passenger terminals, surface automobile parking, hangars, and access to cargo facilities to accommodate civil use.

(12) An evaluation of the ability of surface transportation facilities (road, rail, high-speed rail, maritime) to provide intermodal connections.

(13) A description of the type and level of aviation and community interest in the civil use of a current or former military airport.

(14) One copy of the FAA approved ALP for each copy of the application. The ALP or supporting information should clearly show capacity and conversion related projects. Also, other information such as project costs, schedule, project justification, other maps and drawings showing the project locations, and any other supporting documentation that would make the application easier to understand should be included.

Current Airports Applying for Continuation

B. Airports with less than five years in the MAP need to submit the following in order to respond to this notice and remain in the program.

(1) An Application for Federal Assistance, Standard Form 424, along with the documentation and justification indicated below to request participation in the Military Airport Program. Identify the airport as one with less than five years in the MAP applying for continuation.

(2) Identify the existing and potential levels of visual or instrument operations and aeronautical activity at the current or former military airport and the relieved airport if there is any change from the previous information submitted.

(3) Provide a detailed discussion of the projected civil role and continuing development needs for converting a military airfield to a civil airport, and/or how development projects would reduce delays at an airport with more than 20,000 hours of annual delay in commercial passenger aircraft takeoffs and landings, if applicable.

(4) Describe the five year CIP, including a discussion of major projects, their priorities, projected schedule for project accomplishment, and estimated costs, annotated and identified as capacity related, and/or conversion related purposes.

(5) Submit one copy of the FAA approved ALP for each copy of the application. The ALP should clearly show the CIP projects. Also include any other information or drawings that would show and/or clarify the five-year plan identifying capacity, and conversion related projects, associated costs, schedule, and project justification.

Airports that have already submitted this information for the 1997 Military Airport Program and have been continued only need to submit updated information and changes in order to continue receiving grants under this program.

**Redesignation of Airports Previously Designated and Applying for Another
Five-Year Term in the Program**

C. Airports applying for another five years in the Military Airport Program need to submit the information required by new candidate airports applying for a new designation. They need to explain in their application why another five-year term is needed to accomplish the conversion to the civil role of the airport.

This notice is issued pursuant to section 49 U.S.C. 47118.

Issued at Washington, DC, on May 20, 1998.

Paul L. Galis
Director, Office of Airport Planning and Programming

Bibliography

- “Alexandria International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.EnglandAirpark.org/air.htm>.
- “Austin-Bergstrom International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/newairport/projsum.htm>.
- “Homestead Regional,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from http://www.miami-airport.com/index_text_only.html.
- Kane, Robert M. *Air Transportation*. 12th ed. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1996.
- Mackay, Katurah. “Airport Imperils Florida Parks,” *NPCA Park News*, n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://npca.org/home/npca/np/98-01/jf98ne02.html>.
- “Millington Municipal,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from http://www.zaptek.com/millington/base_reuse.html.
- “Myrtle Beach International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February, 1999. Available from <http://www.southparkvillage.com>.
- “Myrtle Beach International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.state.sc.us/commerce/airport/myr.htm#passenger>.
- “Rickenbacker International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.rickenbacker.org/airport.html>.
- “San Bernardino International,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.eee.org/gov/ivda/sbiaa.htm>.
- “Sawyer Airport,” n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.up.bresnan.net/mqtedc/SAWYER.HTM>.
- United States Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration [4910-13], *Notice of Opportunity to Participate, Criteria Requirements and Change of Application Procedure for Participation in the Fiscal Year 1998 Military Airport Program (MAP)*, 20 May 1998, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/announ.doc>.
- United States Federal Aviation Administration, *13th Annual Report Of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 30 September 1994, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/app500/annrep94/aip.htm>.
- United States Federal Aviation Administration, *14th Annual Report Of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program*, 30 September 1995, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.airportnet.org/depts/federal/faa/aip14th.htm>.
- United States Federal Aviation Administration, *Former Military Airfields Now Operated As Civil Airports*, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://>

- www.faa.gov/arp/closlist.html.
- United States Federal Aviation Administration, *Military Base Conversion and Surplus Property*, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.faa.gov/arp/surplus.html>.
- United States General Accounting Office, "Airport Improvement Program—The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact. RCED-94-209. 06/30/94 (Letter Report)." *Status of Open Recommendations FY97*, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.gao.gov/openrecs97/abstracts/rc94209.htm>.
- United States General Accounting Office, GAO/RCED-94-209, Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate, *Airport Improvement Program: The Military Airport Program Has Not Achieved Intended Impact*. Washington, D.C.: Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, 30 June 1994.
- United States General Accounting Office, GAO/T-RCED-96-94, "Airport Improvement Program – Military Airport Program and Reliever Set-Aside Update." *Abstracts of GAO Reports and Testimony, FY96*, 13 March 1996, n.p. On-line. Internet, 8 December 1998. Available from <http://www.goa.gov/AindexFY96/abstracts/rc96094t.htm>.
- "Williams Gateway," n.p. On-line. Internet, 6 February 1999. Available from <http://www.flywga.org/history.htm>.

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112